CFA - 36 Initral Assessment

PHOTO NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME.

a	INITIAL	ASSESSMENT	FOR	1		
I SITE NAME AND LOCA	rion					
01 JITE NAME CFA Gasoline Tank at C	FA-680					Engineering
03 CITY Scoville		04 STATE Idaho	05 Z	IP CODE	06 COUNTY Butt	i
09 COORDINATES: NORTH 6 7 9 5 9		AST 3 7 2 0	07 C	OUNTY CC	DE 08 CON	G. DIST.
10 DIRECTIONS TO SITE From US 20: NW on Port						
II. OWNER/OPERATOR						
01 OWNER (If known) Department of Energy	(DOE)	02 STRE	ET AD			·
03 CITY Idaho Falls		04 STATI Idaho	1	ZIP COD 83402	1	PHONE NUMBER 5) 526-1122
07 OPERATOR (If known) EG&G Idaho, Inc.		08 STRE				
TTY daho Falls		10 STAT		ZIP COD 83415		PHONE NUMBER 3) 526-1014
III. CHARACTERIZATION	OF POTENTIA	AL HAZARD				
01 ON SITE INSPECTION	YES	<u>xx</u> NO	DAT	E/_		
02 SITE STATUS (Check	•	ive C.	Unkn		none	Unknown
04 DESCRIPTION OF SUBS See Waste Information	TANCES POSS			<u> </u>		
05 DESCRIPTION OF POTE See Hazardous Conditi					OR POPULAT	CION
IV. INFORMATION AVAILA	BLE FROM					
01 CONTACT Clifford Clark	02 OF (Age	ency/Org.) E-ID		03	TELEPHON (208) 526	
04 PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSMENT Terry Alexander		GENCY G&G	06 O			PHONE NUMBER
09 DATE 10/08/86 400 Day Year			<u>t</u>		<u> </u>	:

WASTE INFORMATION								
ASTE STATES, QUANTITIES, AND CHARACTERISTICS								
A. Solid B. Powder C. Sludge	O1 PHYSICAL STATES (Check all that apply) A. Solid E. Slurry B. Powder Fines xxF. Liquid C. Sludge G. Gas D. Other O2 WASTE QUANTITY AT SITE TONS CUBIC YARDS 4.95 NO. OF DRUMS							
03 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS (Check all that apply) _A. ToxicD. Persistent xxG. FlammableJ. Explosive _B. CorrosiveE. SolubleH. IgnitableK. Reactive _C. RadioactiveF. InfectiousI. Highly VolatileL. Incompatible _M. Not Applicable								
II. WASTE	TYPE							
SLU OLW SOL PSD OCC IOC ACD BAS	SUBSTANCE NAME Sludge Oily Waste Solvents Pesticides Other organic chemical Inorganic chemicals Acids Bases Heavy metals	10	S AMOUNT	GA GA	gasoline			
HAZARD 01 CATEGORY		AS 04 BER	STOR/DISI	9 05 CONC	C. 06 MEASURE			
SOURCE	S OF INFORMATION							
specific references, e.q., state titles, sample analysis reports, etc.) Site inspections, personnel interviews, process records, laboratory records.								

and the second s

	HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
I	HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
	A. GROUNDWATER CONT. 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED
	Not Applicable
	B. SURFACE WATER CONT.
	Not Applicable
01 03	C. CONTAMINATION OF AIR 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL POULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED
	Not Applicable .
01 03	D. FIRE/EXPLOSIVE CONDITIONS 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIA POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED
	Not Applicable
	E. DIRECT CONTACT 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED
	Not Applicable
	XX F. CONTAMINATION OF SOIL 02 OBSERVED (Date) XX POTENTIAL NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED
The	ere is a potential for soil contamination around the tank if leakage has cured. There is no evidence of leakage at this time.
	G. DRINKING WATER CONTAMINATION 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED
	Not Applicable

HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
AZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS (Continued)
01 J. DAMAGE TO FLORA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIA 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 K. DAMAGE TO FAUNA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIA 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: (include name(s) of species) ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 L. CONTAMINATION OF FOOD CHAIN 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIA 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01M. UNSTABLE CONTAINMENT OF WASTES 02 OBSERVED (Date)POTENTIAL (SPILL RUNOFF, STANDING LIQUIDS/LEAKING DRUMS) 03 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
_ N. DAMAGE TO OFFSITE PROPERTY 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL ARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 O. CONTAMINATION OF SEWERS,STORM 02 OBSERVED(Date) POTENTIAL DRAINS, WWTPS 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 P. ILLEGAL/UNAUTHORIZED DUMPING 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIA 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
05 DESCRIPTION OF ANY OTHER KNOWN, POTENTIAL OR ALLEGED HAZARDS Not Applicable
III. COMMENTS NONE
 IV. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (List specific references, e.g., state titles, sample analysis, reports) inspections, personnel interview, disposal quantity records, EG&G-WM-687 I. allation Assessment Report, USGS Report IDO-22053 TID-4500 The Influence of Liquid Waste Disposal on the Geochemistry of Water at the NRTS.

As your and the comment of the comme

PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM
I. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION
FACILITY NAME: CFA Gasoline Tank at CFA-680 LOCATION: INEL POINT OF CONTACT: NAME: Clifford Clark ADDRESS: 785 DOE Pl. PHONE: 208-526-1122
REVIEWER: M. L. Saint-Louis DATE: 10-17-86
II. GENERAL FACILITY DESCRIPTION
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITY: (For example: landfill, surface coundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of cility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed or rating; agency action, etc.) This underground Storage tank contains Saloline tuel. Contamination route of primary concern is groundwater
III. SCORES
$SM = 3.2 \cdot (Sgw = 5-6 Ssw = 0 Sa = 0)$ $SFE = 0$ $SDC = 0$

GROUND WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET						
RATING FA	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section		
						3.2
1.ROUTE CHARA Depth to Aqu Concern		(i) 1 2 3	2	0	6	
Net Precipit Permeability Unsaturate	y of the		1	0 2	3 3	
Physical Sta		0 1 2 (3)	1	3	3	
T	Total Route	Characteristics Score		5	15	
2.CONTAINMENT	ŗ	0 1 2 3	1	1	3	3.3
3.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence Pazardous Waste Quantity 0 3 6 9 12 15 18 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8			1	12.	18 8	3.4
To	otal Waste	Characteristics Score		13	26	
4. Multiply		65	1170			
5. Divide line 4 by 1170 and multiply by 100 Sgw= 5.6						

900

and the second second of the s

SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET							
RATING FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section		
					4.2		
1.ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain	© 1 2 3	1	6	3			
1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall Distance to Nearest	0 ① 2 3 ① 1 2 3	1 2	0	3 6			
Surface Water Physical State	0 1 2 3	1	3	3			
Total Route	Characteristics Score		4	15			
2.CONTAINMENT	① 1 2 3	1	6	3	4.3		
3.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 3 6 9 12 15 18 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	12	18	4.4		
Total Waste	Characteristics Score		13	26			
4. Multiply lines 1 :		7	1170				
5. Divide line 4 by 1170 and multiply by 100 Ssw= ()							

APA A

a service and analysis of the con-

AIR ROUTE WORKSHEET							
RATING FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section		
1.HISTORIC RELEASE	(b) 45	1	O	45	5.1		
Date and Location:	See attached supplement	pages					
If line 1 is 0, the S	Sa = 0. Enter on line S	5.					
If line 1 is 45, then	n proceed to line 2.						
2.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Reactivity and Incompatibility	0 1 2 3	1		3	5.2		
Toxicity Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6.7 8	3 1		9 8			
Total Waste	Characteristics Score			20			
TARGETS pulation within 4-mile Radius	0 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30	4 1		30	5.3		
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0 1 2 3	2		6			
Land Use	0 1 2 3	1		3			
Total Targe	et Scores			39	•		
4. Multiply lines 1 x 2 x 3							
5. Divide line 4 by 35100 and multiply by 100 Sa = 0							

-	s	2 S
GROUNDWATER ROUTE SCORE (Sgw)	. 516	31,36
SURFACE WATER ROUTE SCORE (Ssw)	O	O
AIR ROUTE SCORE (Sa)	D	Ö
2 2 2 Sgw + Ssw + Sa		31.36
2 2 2 SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)		5.6
2 2 2 2 $SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)/1.73 = SM$		3. 2

erman dakta

DOCUMENTATION RECORDS FOR HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS: As briefly as possible, summarize the information you used to assign the score for each factor (e.g., "Waste quantity = 4,230 drums plus 800 cubic yards of sludges"). The source of information should be provided for each entry and should be a bibliographic-type reference. Include the location of the document.

FACILITY NAME: CFA Gasoline Tank a + CFA -680
LOCATION:
DATE SCORED: 10-17-86
PERSON SCORING: M.C. Saint-Louis
PRIMARY SOURCE(S) OF INFORMATION:
Site inspection and personnel interview
FACTORS NOT SCORED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION:

COMMENTS OR QUALIFICATIONS:

GROUNDWATER ROUTE

 OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action Contaminants detected (3 maximum);

Mone

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Depth to Aquifer of Concern

Name/description of aquifer(s) of concern:
The Snake River Plain aguifer which Flows ben 't
the INEL is approximately 9600 m². Subsurface
Consist of alternating layers of basalt and silt
Depth(s) from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the
saturated zone [water table(s)] of the aquifer of concern:

- soo feet

Depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal/ storage:

~ 480 feet

Net Precipitation

Mean annual or seasonal precipitation (list months for seasonal):

9.07 inches

Mean annual lake or seasonal evaporation (list months for seasonal):

36 inches

Net precipitation (subtract the above figures):

- 26.93 inches

Permeability of Unsaturated Zone

Soil type in unsaturated zone:

An interbedded sequence of basaltic lava flows and sedimentary deposits.

Permeability associated with soil type:

 10^{-7} to 10^{-3} cm/sec

Physical State

Physical state of substances at time of disposal (or at present time for generated gases):

Liquid

CONTAINMENT

Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

Underground Sealed container

Method of highest score:

Same as above

4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Toxicity and Persistence

Compound(s) evaluated:

Sasohie

Compound with highest score:

Sasoline

<u> Hazardous Waste Quantity</u>

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of O (Give a reasonable estimate even if quantity is above maximum):

1000 sal

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

Based on tank's holding capacity

Checklist for Groundwater Releases

<u>Ide</u>	ntify	ing R	<u>elease</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No
1.	Pote	ntial	for Groundwater Releases from the Unit		
	0	Unit	type and design		
		- '	Does the unit type (e.g., land-based) indicate the potential for release?		×
		-	Does the unit have engineered structures (e.g., liners, leachate collection systems, proper construction materials) designed to prevent releases to groundwater?	<u> x</u>	
	0	Unit	operation		
		-	Does the unit's age (e.g., old unit) or operating status (e.g., inactive, active) indicate the potential for release?	<u>×</u>	
		****	Does the unit have poor operating procedures that increase the potential for release?	.—	*
		-	Does the unit have compliance problems that indicate the potential for a release to groundwater?		<u>\lambda</u>
	0	Phys	ical condition		
		-	Does the unit's physical condition indicate the potential for release (e.g., lack of structural integrity, deteriorating liners, etc.)?		X
	0	Loca	tional characteristics		
		-	Is the unit located on permeable soil so the release could migrate through the unsaturated soil zone?	<u>x</u>	
		-	Is the unit located in an arid area where the soil is less saturated and therefore a release has less potential for downward migration?	<u>*</u>	
		-	Does the depth from the unit to the uppermost aquifer indicate the potential for release?		之

Checklist for Groundwater Releases

				<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
		-	Does the rate of groundwater flow greatly inhibit the migration of a release from the facility?	χ_	
		-	Is the facility located in an area that recharges surface water?	<u>×</u>	
	0	Wast	e characteristics		
		-	Does the waste in the unit exhibit high or moderate characteristics of mobility (e.g., tendency not to sorb soil particles or organic matter in the unsaturated zone)?		
		-	Does the waste exhibit high or moderate levels of toxicity?		
2.	<u>Evid</u>	ence (of Groundwater Releases		
	0	Exis	ting groundwater monitoring systems		
		-	Is there an existing system?	<u> </u>	
		-	Is the system adequate?		$\overline{\lambda}$
		-	Are there recent analytical data that indicate a release?		×
	0	Othe	r evidence of groundwater releases		
			is there evidence of contamination around the unit (e.g., discolored soils, lack of or stressed vegetation) that indicates the potential for a release to groundwater?		$\overline{\times}$
		-	Does local well water or spring water sampling data indicate a release from the unit?		\rightarrow
			he Relative Effect of the Release on Human e Environment		
1.	Expo	sure	Potential		
	0	Cond	itions that indicate potential exposure		
		-	Are there drinking water well(s) located near the unit?	X	
			Does the direction of groundwater flow in- dicate the potential for hazardous constitu- ents to migrate to drinking water wells?	X	

SURFACE WATER ROUTE

1. OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action

Contaminants detected in surface water at the facility or downhill from it (3 maximum):

None

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

· 2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

body in percent:

Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

Average slope of facility in percent:

/ Less than 196

Name/description of nearest downslope surface water:

The Big Lost River flows north-west through the INEL. The average discharge of record is

208,000 acre-feet / year

Average slope of terrain between facility and above cited surface water

Jess than 190

Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?

No

Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of high elevation?

Yes

1-year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches

less than 2 inches

Distance to Nearest Downslope Surface Water

~ 3 miles

Physical State of Waste

Liquid

CONTAINMENT

Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

Underground sealed container

Method with highest score:

same as above.

				<u>Yes</u>	No		
Ide	ntify ¹	ing Re	eleases				
1.	Potential for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Release from the Facility						
	0	Proxi Recep					
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach the nearest downgradient surface water body?		X		
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach off-site receptors (e.g., if facility is located adjacent to populated areas and no barrier exists to prevent overland surface run-off migration)?		<u>×</u>		
	0	Relea	ase Migration Potential				
		-	Does the slope of the facility and intervening terrain indicate potential for release?		<u>x</u> _		
		-	Is the intervening terrain characterized by soils and vegetation that allow overland migration (e.g., clayey soils, and sparse vegetation)?		<u></u>		
		-	Does data on one-year 24-hour rainfall indicate the potential for area storms to cause surface water or surface drainage contamination as a result of run-off?		<u>×</u>		
	0	Unit	Design and Physical Condition				
		-	Are engineered features (e.g., run-off control systems) designed to prevent release from the unit?	*	-		
		-	Does the operational history of the unit indicate that a release has taken place (e.g., old, closed or inactive unit, not inspected regularly, improperly maintained)?		上		
		-	Does the physical condition of the unit indicate that releases may have occurred (e.g., cracks or stress factures in tanks or erosion of earthen dikes of surface impoundments)?		Y		

Checklist for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	o	Waste Characteristics		
		Is the volume of discharge high relative to the size and flow rate of the surface water body?	-	
		Do constituents in the discharge tend to sorb to sediments (e.g., metals)?	<u> </u>	
		Do constituents in the discharge tend to be transported downstream?	<u> </u>	**************************************
		Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of persistence (e.g., PCBs, dioxins, etc.)?		_×
		 Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of toxicity (e.g., metals, chlorinated pesticides, etc.)? 	×	
2.	Evid	ence of Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases		
	0	Are there unpermitted discharges from the facility to surface water that require an NPDES or a Section 404 permit?	wheeligh Com-	<u> </u>
	0	Is there Visible evidence of uncontrolled run-off from units at the facility?	_	\Rightarrow
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human nd the Environment		
1.	o	Are there drinking water intakes nearby?	<u>X</u> ,	
	0	Could human and/or environmental receptors come into contact with surface drainage from the facility?		<u>X</u>
	0	Are there irrigation water intakes nearby?		
	0	Could a sensitive environment (e.g., critical habitat, wetlands) be affected by the discharge (if it is nearby)?	-100 (MINISTER)	<u>}</u>

AIR ROUTE

1.	OBSERVED RELEASE
	Contaminants detected:
	None
	Date and Location of detection of contaminants:
	Methods used to detect the contaminants:
	Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the site:

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

Reactivity and Incompatibility

Most reactive compound:

None

2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

<u>Toxicity</u>

Most toxic compound:

Gasoline

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous waste:

1000 gal.

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

See page 4

Checklist for Air Releases

				Yes	No
<u>Ider</u>	ntifyi	ng Re	eleases		
1.	Poter	ntial	for Air Releases from the Facility		
	0	Unit	Characteristics		
		-	Is the unit operating and does is expose waste to the atmosphere?		X
		-	Does the size of the unit (e.g., depth and surface area) create a potential for air release?		<u>X</u>
	0		the unit contain waste that exhibits a rate or high potential for vapor phase ase?		
		-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as vapor releases?		<u>\(\lambda \)</u>
		M	Do waste constituents have a high potential for volatilization (e.g., physical form, concentrations, and constituent-specific physical and chemical parameters that contribute to volatilization)?		+
	, o	cond:	the unit contain waste and exhibit site itions that suggest a moderate or high itial for particulate release?		
		-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as particulate releases?		<u>X</u>
		-	Do constituents of concern as particulate releases (e.g., smaller, inhalable particulates) have potential for release via wind erosion, reentrainment by moving vehicles, or operational activities?	-enumerous-	<u> </u>
		•••	Are particulate releases comprised of small particles that tend to travel off-site?	_	<u>X</u>
	o		ertain environmental and geographic factors ct the concentrations of airborne contaminant:	s?	
		-	Do atmospheric/geographic conditions limit constituent dispersion (e.g., areas with atmospheric conditions that result in inversions)?		
		-	Is the facility located in a hot, dry area?	<u>x</u>	

Checklist for Air Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
2.	Evide	ence of Air Releases		
	0	Does on-site monitoring data show that releases have occurred or are occurring (e.g., OSHA data)?		<u>×</u>
	o	Have particulate emissions been observed at the site?		¥
,	0	Have there been citizen complaints concerning odors or observed particulate emissions from the site?		<u>×</u>
		ng the Relative Effect of the Release on Human		
1.	Expos	sure Potential		
	0	Is a populated area located near the site?	<u>×</u>	
		INFI		

Checklist for Subsurface Gas Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	No
<u>Ide</u>	ntify	ing a Release		
1.	Pote	ntial for Subsurface Gas Releases		
	o	Does the unit contain waste that generates methane or generates volatile constituents that may be carried by methane (e.g., decomposable refuse/volatile organic wastes)?	_	*
	0	Is the unit an active or closed landfill or a unit closed as a landfill (e.g., surface impoundments and waste piles)?		<u>×</u>
2.		ation of Subsurface Gas to On-site or Off-site dings		
	0	Are on-site or off-site buildings close to the unit?	<u>×</u>	
	0	Do natural or engineered barriers prevent gas migration from the unit to on-site or off-site buildings (e.g., low soil permeability and porosity hydrogeologic barriers/liners, slurry walls, gas control systems)?	_	<u>*</u>
	0	Do natural site characteristics or man-made structures (e.g., underground power trans-mission lines, sewer pipes/sand and gravel lenses) facilitate gas migration from the unit to buildings?		×
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human nd the Environment		
1.	Expo	sure Potential		
	0	Does building usage (e.g., residential, commercial) exhibit high potential for exposure?		λ

1	20	B 1 "T"	ΛТ	\$18 /	CNIT	•
1.	LU	IV I	МΙ	ויווו	ENT	

Hazardous substances present:

gasoline

Type of containment, if applicable:

Sealed container

2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Direct Evidence

Type of instrument and measurements:

None

Ignitability

Compound used:

gasolino

Reactivity

Most reactive compound:

Nune

Incompatibility

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

Mone

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility:

1000 gal

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

See page 4

TARGETS

Distance to Nearest Population

Distance to Nearest Building

less them 50 feet nce to Nearest Building Less than 10 feet

Distance to Sensitive Environment

Distance to wetlands:

Greater than 100 feet

Distance to critical habitat:

Greater than 1/2 mile

Land Use

Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:

The INEL is a research facility. There are no commercial/ industrial facilities within 1 mile.

Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 1 mile or less:

Greater than 1 mile

Distance to prima agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

If a historic or landmark site (National Register or Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site?

Big Southern Butte

Population Within 2-Mile Radius

1214

Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius

42 occupied CFA Buildings

DIRECT CONTACT

OBSERVED INCIDENT

Date, location, and pertinent details of incident:

None

2. ACCESSIBILITY

Describe type of barrier(s):

24 hour surveillance System by INEL personnel

3. CONTAINMENT

Type of containment, if applicable:

Sealed container

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Toxicity

Compounds evaluated:

gasoline

Compound with highest score:

gasoline

5. TARGETS

Population within one-mile radius

Distance to critical habitat (of endangered species)

Greater than 1 mile